

## REMARKS

### I. Introduction

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 1, 10, 12 and 17 have been amended. No new matter is being presented, and approval and entry are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-17 are pending and under consideration. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

### II. Prior Art Rejections

The Office Action mailed February 22, 2007 rejected claims 1-9 and 14-17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over newly cited De Breed (U.S. Patent 6,944,628) and Tanner (U.S. Patent Publication 2004/0243588); and rejected claims 10-13 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by newly-cited De Breed. An Advisory Action was mailed on June 12, 2007 in response to Applicant's comments filed on May 22, 2007. All rejections are traversed below and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Item 6 in the Office Action relied on De Breed (U.S. Patent 6,944,628), column 1, line 25-30, to teach or suggest "accessing a source data set of uniquely identified persons", as previously recited in independent claim 1. The Advisory Action stated "Applicant is encouraged to amend the claims to better reflect what the [A]pplicant intends to claim as the invention". Pursuant to that request, claim 1 has been amended to recite "accessing a private source dataset, not derived from public data sources, of uniquely identified persons, identified by a globally unique identifier and remains the same throughout the lifetime of the person" at lines 3-6. De Breed disclosed "data of private individuals and organisations [sic] can be found in an electronic or paper telephone directory ... a data set is available or made accessible in which all publicly known data of private individuals and/or organisations [sic] is stored" at lines 43-46. Thus, the data set from De Breed comes from publicly accessible data sources and is not "a private source dataset, not derived from public data sources" as recited in claim 1. In addition, the Examiner made reference to the "tax number" disclosed in De Breed teaching a social security number in the Advisory Action mailed June 12, 2007. De Breed merely stated "[t]he e-mail address can also comprise the tax number ... and the like" at lines 50-53. Thus, De Breed mentions that a tax number may be used as an email address, but is silent whether the email address or the tax number is stored or used in "a private source dataset ... of uniquely identified persons, identified by a globally unique identifier and remains the same throughout the lifetime of the person" as recited above in claim 1.

Furthermore, nothing has been cited in Tanner which makes up for the deficiencies in De Breed. Therefore, it is submitted that claim 1, and claims 2-9 which depend therefrom and add further patentable distinctions, are patentably distinguishable over the cited prior art. The claimed method achieves automatically and reliably determining which accounts of a firm are held by an officer, director of a publicly traded company or other persons of public interest that are not achievable by De Breed or Tanner or combination thereof, and therefore further supports patentability.

Independent claim 17 recites "a first storage storing a private source dataset, not derived from public data sources, of uniquely identified persons, identified by a globally unique identifier and remains the same throughout the lifetime of the person," at lines 3-5. For the reasons discussed above, it is submitted that claim 17 is patentably distinguishable over the cited prior art, including in particular the newly-cited primary reference of De Breed.

The Office Action, at item 4, rejected claims 10-13 under 35 U.S.C § 102(e) as being anticipated by newly cited De Breed. Claim 10 recites "automatically determining, without a key or identifier uniquely identifying the target person, with substantial certainty that a target name corresponds with a particular unique individual in the general population" at lines 6-8. The Office Action cited De Breed, column 1, lines 25-30, as anticipating this recited feature. De Breed, however, is silent and nothing has been cited that discloses "automatically determining, without a key or identifier uniquely identifying the target person" as recited above for claim 10. Therefore, it is submitted that claim 10, and claims 11-16 which depend therefrom and add further patentable distinctions, are patentably distinguishable over the cited prior art.

### **III. Request for Interview**

It is believed that the amendments herein are consistent with the Examiner's request that appeared in the Advisory Action. If the present amendments do not overcome De Breed and Tanner, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned to discuss what further amendments may be necessary to clearly distinguish over the prior art.

In addition, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

Serial No. 10/748,196

Finally, if there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 6/22/07

By: Richard A. Gollhofer  
Richard A. Gollhofer  
Registration No. 31,106

1201 New York Ave, N.W., 7th Floor  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 434-1500  
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501